HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIV, No. 16 Saturday, April 20, 1957 Washington, D. C.

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

News Section Printed in *Two Sections*

Revolt Against Ike: The Edgar Eisenhower episode — despite its all too human and therefore quite humorous trimmings — is taken rather seriously in the Capital.

It is believed and — among many Republicans — it is hoped that Edgar Eisenhower may have forcibly impressed on the President the fact that a country-wide political revolt against his leadership is well under way. It is known that the President does not like to read newspapers and relies on aides to bring important matters to his attention. These assistants, it is feared, too often refrain from bringing up unpleasant happenings. But this week, on top of Edgar, other developments should have served as warnings.

(1) The President, in the past 48 hours, could not have failed to note that the House of Representatives drastically cut down his request for a $145-million appropriation for the United States Information Agency (USIA), just two days after he had made a point of appealing to them not to do so. The bill was reduced by about $38 million, representing a 26 per cent cut. Republican leaders, recognizing the rebellious mood, did not even try to rally party members to block the reduction. In short, the President put his influence "on the line" and lost — such is the verdict of observers.

(2) And early this week, Meade Alcorn, the GOP Chairman, returned from an eight-state regional Republican meeting in Omaha with unwelcome tidings for the President. At an unusually outspoken gathering, GOP delegates told him that the people of those states were strongly against the President's high Budget, against foreign aid and against Federal aid to education. On all these issues, the President has stood adamant for large appropriations.

But, from the Nebraska metropolis, we learn that there was not only the fact of popular opposition to Presidential desires, there was also deep-seated and at times emotional resistance to his requests. Observers who attended the Omaha meeting came away impressed by the vehemence of this sentiment (which seems to reflect the feeling of all this area). For instance, when Alcorn asked for "brutally frank" criticisms of GOP policy, the usually restrained Omaha *World-Herald* editorially retorted: "Can't he [Alcorn] sense the feeling of betrayal among millions of Americans as the Republican party plunges hell-bent for the Welfare State?"

Today, Congress is leaving the Capital for the Easter recess. Big tests in legislation await its return ten days hence. And politically acute Washington wonders what impressions members of Congress will bring back from their constituencies.

In and Out of the White House: Over the press club bar, the experts agreed that Ike's handling of the newsman's question (at Wednesday's White House press conference) about Edgar Eisenhower was flawless: "He has been criticizing me ever since I was five years old." It stood out in contrast to various boners which he has been committing recently.

● Along protocol-conscious Embassy Row, the question is asked: "Why didn't Edgar Eisenhower stop at the White House with his brother and sister-in-law during his stay in Washington, instead of at the Statler?" The answer is that Brother Edgar never does that — did not, indeed stay with Ike when visiting Washington a year ago. At that time, Edgar came down with a virus infection and was confined to his room at the Statler for several days. Brother Edgar bluntly told friends here then that he did not intend to be a guest at the expense of the taxpayers of the U.S., and never would — that he had even refused Ike's offer to send him out to Walter Reed (U.S. Army hospital) to be treated for the virus. Apparently, he felt the same way on his visit here this year.

● Edgar is a close friend of Frank Holman, former American Bar Association President and "father" of the Bricker Amendment. Holman also hails from the state of Washington. The President's brother became an ardent advocate of the famous amendment to ban treaty law and actually made two trips to the Nation's Capital in recent years to try to convert Ike to support of the amendment. Senator John Bricker says that Ike once remarked to him: "Unless I get behind your amendment, I'm afraid I'm going to have a big split in my family."

● Edgar Eisenhower's remarks about people whom he suspects of influencing "Dwight" for the worse have inspired much talk about other persons who might have been included on Edgar's

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

blacklist. One press authority, whose knowledge of the White House commands respect, gives us the names of five who hold no public office, but who can get in to see Ike without clearing through the Appointments Secretary or through Assistant Sherman Adams. They are, as follows: Milton Eisenhower; "Jack" McCloy, Chairman of the Board of the Chase Manhattan Bank, of New York; Paul Hoffman; General Lucius Clay, Chairman of the Continental Can Company; and Sidney Weinberg, of Goldman-Sachs Company of New York, investment bankers.

● HUMAN EVENTS learns that "I Like Edgar" buttons can be obtained (25 for $1.00) from "I Like Edgar," 2425 Foxhall Road, Washington, D. C.

Democrats: As seen from the vantage point of the Capital, the news that Paul Butler, National Democratic Chairman, may run for Senator in Indiana next year in opposition to incumbent Senator William E. Jenner epitomizes the striking decline of Democratic fortunes. If Butler is the best they can find in the Hoosier state, it is remarked, then the Democrats have touched the nadir.

In Washington, Butler is known as one of the men who shaped Adlai Stevenson's extraordinary "design for defeat" last fall. And since then, Butler has headed a group of Northern Democratic "liberals" who have sought to "advise" the Democrats in Congress as to the best policies for the party. Messrs. Lyndon Johnson and Sam Rayburn have given this group a mighty cold shoulder.

If the Democrats in Indiana are really serious about such a nomination, then they will find against them a Jenner at the height of his career and power. He has behind him a united state organization headed by his good friend, Governor Handley; after an intraparty scrap he and Handley thoroughly routed and purged the "modern Republican" wing under ex-Governor Craig. It is noticeable that, when given an opening by a reporter this week, Jenner did not express a wish that Ike back his candidacy for re-election. It seems unlikely that anyone can be found to contest Jenner's renomination. Today, the conservative trend of the country favors Jenner. He is forceful, dynamic, a "militant conservative." Indeed, newsmen here find it almost farcical that the Democrats should consider running a "liberal" such as Butler against the Senator, particularly under present conditions.

The Norman Case: Sorting facts from rumors, HUMAN EVENTS is able to present the successive takes of the fast moving drama arising from the mysterious death of the Canadian envoy to Cairo, as follows:

Stage One: Led by Canadian Secretary for External Affairs Lester Pearson, "liberals" in both Canada and the U.S. had fabricated a picture of a "witch-hunting" U.S. Senate committee bringing against the Canadian diplomat false charges which "hounded" him into committing suicide. The rapid and expert marshalling of the publicity of this myth recalled the workings of the "apparat" that in 1948 sought to discredit young Congressman Nixon and the House Un-American Activities Committee for their exposure of Alger Hiss. (The discovery of the "pumpkin papers" rescued the investigators.)

The objective of the hue and cry became crystal clear to conservative Senators: the closing up of all Congressional probes against subversives in or out of Government.

Stage Two: The conservative forces decided to fight back. They had the facts on Norman's long record of Communist activities and had other startling information. They released or allowed to appear statements showing that their information had been corroborated by security agencies of the Executive arm of the U.S. Government. Material was prepared for an all-out, plain speaking, no-holds-barred debate on the floor, featured by speeches from Eastland, Jenner and others.

Stage Three: The White House, hearing of this developing counter-offensive sent word to the Senate leaders of both parties: "For Heaven's sake, let sleeping dogs lie. We don't want to appear to be interfering in the Canadian general election campaign which is just starting."

Stage Four: The Senate Leadership went swiftly into action, with positive results. Eastland took the floor and firmly defended the course of his committee. He said that Senator Neuberger (the spearhead of the "liberals") would desist if he knew the facts. But that he, Eastland, would not divulge these facts on the floor. Neuberger (probably coached on some of the facts) desisted in the most subdued way. And the show was over.

Meanwhile, across our northern border, events were moving in the same direction. The Opposition in Canada's Parliament was criticizing Foreign Secretary Pearson for concealing Norman's Communist background. By the time we are putting this to press, the Canadians in their own way are thoroughly getting to the bottom of the matter.

(By telephone from Montreal, a member of the HUMAN EVENTS staff learns that some circles in Canada by no means blame the U.S. Senate committee, indeed rejoice that it stood its ground; they say that Pearson is forced on the defensive; and finally, it is possible that Norman did not commit suicide but was murdered.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Since the Canadians, through their own channels of representative government, are illuminating the matter for their own best national interests, we feel that Americans should know some, at least, of the facts which emboldened their constructive forces of Congress to defend themselves and their Congressional right to investigate. These facts are, as follows:

(1) On March 25th Canadians had already requested a security investigation of E. Herbert Norman. In Quebec, the Pan-Canadian Anti-Communist League had made this public demand on that date. In Washington it is believed that soon thereafter a security investigation by the Canadian Government was commenced.

(2) Intelligence agencies in Cairo have information indicating that Norman, a few days before the British-French-Israeli invasion of Egypt last fall, leaked advance information on this impending attack to Soviet circles. It is presumed that the latter passed it on to Nasser. Norman, it is known, was under security investigation by his own Government at the time he died.

(3) Some U.S. Senators had long been in possession of the facts about the strange associations between Lester Pearson (at the time when he was in the Canadian diplomatic mission to Washington during the last war) and a certain Canadian businessman known for his Communist affiliations. Pearson — it should be added — during his Washington stay had been privy to vital top-level secrets of the U.S. Government. These facts (and many others) would almost certainly have been brought out by debate last Friday in the Senate.

Indeed, if full and uninhibited debate had been held last week, it is believed that Senators would have flatly accused Pearson of trying to make the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee the "goat" of the Norman affair, to protect himself.

Soviet Economy: A drastic step taken last week by the Soviet Government, say economic analysts, exposed to view the fatal weakness of the Communist system. In an attempt to stave off financial collapse, the Soviet Government stopped payment of interest on its bonds and deferred their repayment until 1977 and later. This, say the experts, amounts to repudiation of the Soviet national debt — an act of extreme desperation. This measure, it is said, reveals that the Soviet economy cannot sustain the cost of its arms programs and other ventures.

Also exposed by this sudden turn of events are the American "liberals" who have claimed that the Communist slave economy has "caught up with" and is now "overtaking" the American free enterprise system.

The Case for Foreign Aid: A flash from a correspondent in a Mediterranean port runs: "Navy surface transport has been used to haul food to the Naples zoo. The argument given me by Navy public relations is that it's good 'community relations' and enables the Italians to feed their lions more cheaply."

Conservation: New example of how a Government program, once started, is never stopped:

In 1936, immediately after the Supreme Court invalidated the New Deal's original AAA (Agricultural Adjustment Administration), Congress enacted a stop-gap, temporary substitute which it called the Agricultural Conservation Program.

It provided for the Federal Government to make payments to farmers, amounting to roughly half of the actual cost to the farmer, for practices having the effect of conserving his land and its fertility — contouring, diversion of land from continuous planting to one crop, cattle watering ponds, wind erosion control steps, and so forth.

Originally, it was a frank and open method of putting cash into the nation's farm economy as an emergency step. But the farmers, their Congressional bloc always potent, liked the plan. Each year (or two years, recently) Congress has enacted new laws extending it. This week, as the program reached the majority age of 21, the House passed a bill to make it permanent. The Senate undoubtedly will follow suit.

No single farmer may receive more than $2,500 annually of Federal payments under this program, thus making it of primary benefit to smaller operators. Total cost to taxpayers during its 21 years of reaching adulthood: roughly six and one-half billion dollars.

Labor Front: Capital observers note the emphasis on a shorter work week in the United Automobile Workers convention discussions of forthcoming bargaining negotiations. Talk of extension and expansion of the Guaranteed Annual Wage feature was largely relegated to the background.

Reason: Continued grumblings of dissatisfaction among older, more experienced workers who, because of seniority, would be the last to be laid off in any operations curtailment, and therefore feel they get nothing out of the widely heralded GAW feature of last year's contracts.

UAW President Walter Reuther hopes the new emphasis on shortening the work week will allay this dissatisfaction and prevent a threatened open rebellion against his UAW leadership.

Likewise, he hopes the separate bargaining privileges voted by the convention for specialized craftsmen will allay their even more open discon-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tent over being lumped under single industry-wide contracts, along with production-line and all other workers in an industry, even janitors.

These craftsmen, relatively few in number, have become increasingly unhappy in recent years because of a growing conviction they could do better for themselves wage-wise by bargaining separately. There has been much talk in several key UAW centers of splitting off from that union and setting up their own new organization.

The UAW convention decision in effect creates autonomous (as far as bargaining is concerned) units within the parent union; actually, AFL-style craft units. Industry and Government leaders fear the action poses a new strike threat; a walkout by a group of these craftsmen, even though involving only a few men, could close down an entire industry by halting production of essential parts.

Education Front: A new idea in the field of higher education is meeting with favor in the New England states: a private organization to give financial assistance to worthy college students. Pilot organization in the experiment is the Massachusetts Higher Education Assistance Corporation. Organized in 1956, MHEAC is designed to assist students in obtaining and repaying loans from banks. The corporation guarantees repayment of a substantial amount of the principal, making funds available at low interest rates.

Now President Charles F. Phillips of Maine's Bates College is advocating a similar program for Maine. The *Christian Science Monitor* reported that Phillips' suggestion was "well received" by the group of educators to whom he proposed the plan. Supporters of these programs emphasize that they will be completely private and non-profit.

Education analysts describe this new development as a blow to the plans of Federal Aid proponents, who have been pushing a program of Federal interference with education "beyond the high school."

Taxes: As weary HUMAN EVENTS staffers filed Form No. 1040 last week, news arrived of a second "emancipation proclamation" — quite apropos of the nation's annual scramble to calculate and scrape together the huge Federal income tax. The news concerned a mass meeting held in Rockford, Ill., April 12, and addressed by America's two foremost critics of the income tax — former Internal Revenue Commissioner T. Coleman Andrews and former Governor J. Bracken Lee.

Declaring that America must free its "tax slaves," Andrews and Lee scathed the $72 billion spending Budget, foreign aid, and the expanding Federal bureaucracy. Andrews charged that the income tax law was "the most vicious law ever written on the statute books of any country of the world." Both speakers urged a strong grass-roots campaign to end America's plunge into the cycle of "Tax, Spend and Bust."

The meeting—attended by approximately 1,000, according to the *Rockford Morning Star* — was sponsored by the Americans for Tax Reduction, an organization originating in Rockford. John H. Page, one of the leaders of the group, said that they hope to encourage similar organizations throughout Illinois.

Oppenheimer Debate: Observers at Harvard report that conservatives carried the day, April 16, in a debate over the appointment of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer as Harvard's William James Lecturer. Professor Willmoore Kendall of Yale and Dr. Medford Evans of Northwestern State College of Louisiana argued against the appointment. Supporting Oppenheimer were American Civil Liberties Union attorneys Chase Kimball and Howard S. Whiteside. The debate was sponsored by the Athenaeum, a Harvard undergraduate debating group.

Dr. Evans, a frequent HUMAN EVENTS contributor, documented Oppenheimer's record of untruthfulness and Communist associations. Professor Kendall stated that the Harvard Lectureship was an important phase in the "liberal" attempt to rehabilitate Oppenheimer's reputation, and to damage America's security program. Those present report that the overflow audience greeted the conservative arguments with enthusiastic and prolonged applause.

Letter from JOHN H. RAY, Congressman from the 15th District of New York: "HUMAN EVENTS brings each week an interesting and timely analysis of major issues. I would not like to be without it."

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.

Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.

Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

Bound Annual Volume with complete Index $15. Only 1955 and 1956 Volumes are available.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS
HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1957.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XIV, No. 16 HUMAN EVENTS April 20, 1957

Article Section

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

The Communists, the professional immigrationists, and the vote-hustling demagogues have formed a "united front" which constitutes a grave threat to our protective immigration system.

WHAT YOU CAN DO: To overcome the pressures to destroy our immigration system, Americans who believe in the Walter-McCarran Act must make their own influence felt. Organizations such as The American Legion, The Daughters of the American Revolution, The Veterans of Foreign Wars, The Sons of the American Revolution, and The American Coalition of Patriotic Societies are already on record in support of our immigration law. By writing to your Congressman and your two Senators, you can add your voice to theirs. This year, more than ever before, legislators on Capitol Hill are awake to sentiment from home. Send them a copy of this article. Let them know that you are in favor of the Walter-McCarran Act. Insist that they vote against any weakening amendments. YOUR LETTER IS IMPORTANT!

THE WAR AGAINST OUR IMMIGRATION LAW

By REPRESENTATIVE FRANCIS E. WALTER

SPEARHEADED by the Communists, their fellow-travelers, Congressional "liberals" and spokesmen for the so-called ethnic minority blocs, the assault on America's immigration system is increasing in intensity every month. Attempts to amend or abolish the Immigration and Nationality Act — generally referred to as the Walter-McCarran Act — have become standard operating procedure at every session of Congress since passage of the Act in 1952.

In the closing hours of the Congress last year, those who are bent on wrecking our protective immigration system came within a hair's breadth of accomplishing their job of destruction. On the very last day of the session, Senators Arthur Watkins and Everett Dirksen, in an unprecedented move, appended to a routine bill a series of amendments which would have demolished the "national origins" quota system and opened the floodgates. These amendments were rushed through the Senate without customary hearings and without committee reports.

In fact, these amendments had not even been printed when they were passed and sent to the House of Representatives — where the wheels had been greased to slip them by in the final rush before adjournment. Amendments of this sort are invariably sent to the appropriate committee before submission to the House. In this particular case, however, the amendments were sent over after the House Judiciary Committee had held its last meeting of the session. As Chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee in the House, I was able to head off adoption of these amendments only by persistent effort as the clock was ticking off the closing moments of that body.

These amendments, which have again been introduced in the present Congress, contain provisions which would open every valve the Walter-McCarran Act furnishes for controlling the number and caliber of aliens gaining admission to our shores. If the provisions of these amendments are adopted, the net result will be (1) destruction of our "national origins" immigration system which gears the flow of immigration for maximum assimilation and for the preservation of our cultural integrity; (2) increase of total annual immigration from around 230,000 to well in excess of 600,000; and (3) emasculation of the chief screening and security safeguards of the present law.

Moreover, unless the rank and file of patriotic citizens — at the crossroads of America — demand of their Senators and Congressmen that they vote against these weakening amendments, they are likely to be adopted in response to the mounting clamor of leftist organizations.

The Committee on Un-American Activities recently disclosed that the Communist party has created over 180 organizations for the purpose of bringing "grass roots" pressure on the Congress to destroy the Walter-McCarran Act. At the recent convention of the Communist party in New York City, the destruction of this law was one of the two legislative objectives on which the twenty-odd thousand Communist agents in this country were ordered to concentrate during this year.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE WALTER-MCCARRAN Immigration Act, the result of four-and-a-half years of painstaking research and exhaustive hearings, represents the simplification and codifying of 148 different immigration and naturalization laws. It has two chief purposes: (1) to insure that the citizens of the United States — whatever their ancestry — will form a true nation, not a hodgepodge of unassimilated ethnic minority groups; and (2) to keep from our shores criminals, Communists and other subversives.

To understand what danger lies in the current proposals to change this law, it is necessary to understand just what the Walter-McCarran Act provides, and the principles it embodies.

The Immigration and Nationality Act (Public Law 414, 82nd Congress) became law on June 26, 1952, over the veto of President Truman. Congress overrode Truman's veto by a vote of 278 to 113 in the House, and a vote of 57 to 26 in the Senate. *As those figures suggest, the passage was a "bipartisan" effort.* It was a faithful consensus of national sentiment on the subject of immigration.

Until Congress stamped its decisive approval on the Walter-McCarran Act, American immigration law was a snarl of separately enacted, and in many cases conflicting, statutes. Numerous injustices, such as racial exclusion, resulted from this tangle. On the other hand, many aliens were admitted who should have been kept out. One of the gravest weaknesses in our old laws was the fact that our immigration and naturalization policy were not coordinated. The result of this failing was that ethnic blocs grew up within our country, estranged from the society about them. Such enclaves are notoriously easy pickings for unscrupulous politicians, and often prove fertile ground for the seeds of Communist agitation.

The Communist question is, in many ways, the most serious that the Walter-McCarran Act is designed to handle. Professor Louis Budenz testified before the Senate Immigration Subcommittee that the "general world pattern pursued by the Kremlin" shows that

> **. . . the direct responsibility shall be in the hands of aliens in any respective country in which operations are carried on. It is the fixed design of Moscow to employ aliens in the most responsible positions in every country. This assures that nostalgia and patriotism may be reduced to the minimum . . . *The native Communist leader, therefore, is always under the control of a superior, who is an alien, or an ex-alien, the latter having received his citizenship merely in order to serve the Kremlin more effectively.*** **(Italics added.)**

This is, obviously, a common sense measure by the Communists. While I am convinced that the vast majority of our naturalized citizens are loyal Americans, I think it is apparent that immigrants, coming to our shores with prior loyalties, can function as subversives with less emotional stress than native-born citizens. The shrewdness of the Communists in exploiting this fact is borne out by this startling information: analysis of approximately 5,000 "of the more militant members of the Communist Party" revealed that 91.5 per cent were either of foreign birth, married to persons of foreign birth, or born of foreign parents. Over half traced their origins to Russia and the satellite countries. It is beyond question, therefore, that prior loyalties, in the form of cultural and emotional commitments, are used to advantage by the Communists.

To combat this grave danger, the Immigration and Nationality Act incorporated provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950, enabling Immigration authorities to screen out subversive elements. The immigration law now provides for deportation of alien Communists, and cancellation of the citizenship of naturalized Communists who obtained citizenship fraudulently. It also tightens up procedures for screening out criminals, prostitutes, narcotic-addicts and the like.

THE METHOD DEVISED for achieving maximum assimilation of aliens admitted — and minimum politicking — is called the "National Origins Quota System." This formula was introduced in the Immigration Act of 1924, and has been retained in the present law. It provides that the annual quota for any one of the 85 major quota areas shall equal one-sixth of one per cent of the number of inhabitants of the United States, computed from the 1920 census, originating in that area. The total number of quota immigrants now admissible each year is 154,657. Additionally, a substantial number of "nonquota" immigrants are admitted each year. These include husbands, wives and children of American citizens and natives of independent countries of the Western Hemisphere. There is no numerical limitation on the entrance of nonquota immigrants, and their numbers swell the ranks of immigrants coming to this country to well over 225,000 annually.

In the fiscal year 1956, the United States admitted 321,625 "immigrants" — people who took up permanent residence in this country. Of this number, 232,315 were admitted under our regular immigration laws and 89,310 were admitted under the so-called Refugee Relief Act, which is in reality only a device for admission of more aliens into this country through the back door. These figures represent substantial increases over fiscal year 1955, and the trend indicates that the pressure upon our immigration system will increase proportionately each year.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The "national origins" system is vilified, in the chant of the immigration hucksters, as "racist," "bigoted," and "reactionary." These accusations are summed up in the classic phrase of the demagogue bidding for minority bloc votes: the "national origins" system, it is charged, makes "second-class citizens" of immigrants.

All of these accusations are false. The Walter-McCarran Act is, in many essential respects, the most liberal immigration law in the world. The charge of "racism" is especially ludicrous. The truth is that this immigration statute removed, for the first time, racial bars to immigration. The quotas for Asiatic countries are now determined by the same formula as those for European countries, i.e., according to the proportion that their group in our country bears to the total population. Congressman Walter H. Judd, an acknowledged authority on the Far East, has said that "this law removes, at one stroke, the remaining racial discriminations in our nationality and immigration laws which have so greatly contributed to ill feeling in many parts of the world."

The culminating charge, that the national origins system creates "second-class citizens," is the most hypocritical of all. A "second-class citizen," we are informed, is someone who is denied opportunities open to the rest of society, and who is thereby placed on unequal footing with his fellow citizens. The "national origins" system produces no such results. In fact, it is the expressed purpose of that system to make sure that all new citizens, by assimilation into society, *are* given equal opportunities, and *are* placed on an equal footing with everyone else. On the other hand, it is those who thrive on manipulated ethnic votes, who want, desperately, to create "second-class" citizens. These vote hucksters want to build up blocs whose interests are cut off from those of the country at large. Isolated from many of the main issues that are vital to the United States, these blocs are perfect material for the political demagogue.

The political impulse behind many of the attacks on the "national origins" system can be seen when we inspect the proposed alternatives. The chief substitute which has, from time to time, been proposed is "the Unified Quota system." Under this system, admissions would not be decided on an automatic, mathematical basis. Rather, the power to determine admission would be vested in a commission, politically appointed. Such a change is roughly one from "a government of laws" to "a government of men." It would instantly convert immigration from a policy conducted in the national interest to a policy directed by political greed — in which each pressure group would strive to make its particular influence felt, and in which the demagogues would attempt to jam through blocs of immigrants representing just so many captive votes. The "national origins" system is the only impartial method of quota allocations ever devised. In the explosive context of immigration, setting up a system free of political conniving is a major job in itself.

THE "NATIONAL ORIGINS" controversy boils down to this: is there such a thing as "the United States"? Do the American people have a culture which unites them as a nation? If we are to judge by results, the answer to these questions has to be "yes." There is something about America which has made it great and strong, and which has made it and kept it free, although — in my opinion — it has nothing to do with "race" or "superiority" or "inferiority." Rather, it is a matter of basic ideology, cultural attitudes, of a common heritage. That we are a "nation of immigrants" is indeed a part of that heritage, but the emphasis in that phrase is on the word "nation." We are "immigrants" who have fused into one people, with one national loyalty — to the United States of America.

This country can continue in its great traditions only if its citizens understand and believe in them. New citizens, therefore, must be brought in by a pattern and in degrees which will allow them to become a true part of American life. Immigration which contradicts this pattern or which exceeds those degrees is a disservice to the immigrant and our society alike.

As part of the "clipping away" of the "national origins" system, it is proposed that the base year — 1920 — chosen for establishing the total number of admissible quota immigrants, be changed to 1950. This one amendment, if enacted, would not only increase the quotas by about 85,000 annually, but would change the entire complexion of the cultural composition of immigration to this country. Because of numerous special enactments (such as the Displaced Persons Law and the Refugee Relief Act) and a disproportionate use of quotas by natives of certain countries, the flow of immigration during the last several years has not been patterned to maintain the cultural balance of our population.

Another pending amendment is to apply the unused portion from large quotas to the waiting lists for small quotas. By completely rearranging the apportionment of visas, this proposal would further weaken the "national origins" system. Current attempts to alter the quota provisions relating to the "Asia-Pacific Triangle" — by which orientals born in Western Hemisphere countries are chargeable to oriental quotas — would have the same effect. Another attempt to destroy the "national origins" system is the proposal that "dependent colonies" take over the unused quotas of their mother coun-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

try. All of these proposals are thinly veiled attempts to wreck the "national origins" quota system, which is vital to the preservation of the basic cultural composition of our society. For that reason, they must be defeated.

The onslaught on our immigration laws is not limited to the "national origins" system. The tactic is to strike from many directions at once, with the hope that through sheer weight of numbers, some of the amendments will get through.

Here are some of the other proposals that have been introduced in the House and Senate:

1. It is proposed that a "Board of Visa Appeals" be established to review consular decisions granting or withholding visas, with its decisions in turn subject to judicial review. This means that immigration to the United States would assume the status of an adjudicable *right* of aliens, rather than a privilege.

2. Under the present law, the Consular Officers may refuse to issue a visa if they have reason to believe that an alien seeks to enter the United States for purposes detrimental to the welfare or security of the country. It is proposed that the Consular Officers be forced *to establish in court* their grounds for refusal. Again, this makes immigration a right, rather than privilege. It would also force the Government, at the demand of an alien, to disclose secret security information.

3. It is urged that broad discretionary power be vested in the Attorney General to admit aliens — outside the quotas — when he deems it "in the public interest," and to permit aliens who have illegally entered the country to remain here permanently. The net effect of such provisions would be to open a huge gap in our immigration laws and to put a premium on illegal entry, when there are an estimated 3 to 5 million aliens illegally in the United States already.

4. The Walter-McCarran Act provides that an alien who has received, in the United States, pardon for a crime is exempt from deportation. It is proposed that this benefit include those pardoned for crimes by other countries. Such a provision, of course, would place power over immigration to the United States, in such cases, in the hands of foreign governments.

5. The present law stipulates that naturalized citizens who return to their homeland and establish residence for three years, or who establish residence in some other country for five, lose their citizenship. It is proposed that such residence abroad should not be cause for loss of citizenship. The effect of this proposal would be to confer upon aliens the benefits of American citizenship, and then to permit them to evade the duties of citizenship.

Analysis of these and literally dozens of other pending amendments reveals a common thread: *they all aim to subordinate the interests of the United States to the interests of other countries and their citizens.* This is, in fact, the major theme of diatribes against the Walter-McCarran Act. It is asserted that Europe, Asia, and almost every country in the world, are suffering from too many people, and too little wealth. Therefore, they say, it is the "duty" of the United States to accept the population surplus of other nations, irrespective of their assimilability or our own population problems.

THIS IS NOT the philosophy by which I have been guided in my career in the Congress. I believe that the first duty of an elected representative of the American people is to serve his own country. It is quite true that the population of the world, like the population of the United States, is expanding rapidly. Europe's surplus population alone is estimated at 79,000,000. The far east is a vast sea of humanity with a combined population totalling almost a billion people. To suppose that the United States, through its immigration policy, can cure the problems presented by such masses of people is sheer folly. If we should open wide the floodgates to receive humanity's surplus, we would not improve the lot of the "underprivileged" countries of the world. We would only succeed in dragging ourselves down closer to their level.

While other nations of the world may, through envy or misunderstanding, want us to follow such a policy, they would suffer from it as much as we. For it is only as long as the United States remains strong and free that it can hold back the tide of communism. If we go under, they will go with us.

Additional copies of this 4-page Article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. News section sold separately — at same rates. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy; for airmail, add two cents a copy.

Representative Francis E. Walter (D.-Pa.) is now serving his thirteenth consecutive term in Congress. He is the chairman of two key House committees — the Subcommittee on Immigration and the Committee on Un-American Activities.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED